

Docket No. F-8507

Ser. No. 10/518,280

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-8 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Claim 2 is cancelled herein. Claims 1 and 3-8 are amended herein to clarify the invention. Other formal matters are attended to that were not addressed by the Examiner and accordingly are considered unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 1-7 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as a result of informalities stated in the Office Action. The claims are amended to remove or correct the informalities noted in the Office Action. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-7 and their allowance are earnestly requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Hughes reference. Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*,

Docket No. F-8507

Ser. No. 10/518,280

221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Claim 1 is now amended to recite the following features:

 said first and second inner rings being disposed adjacent each other with said first ends thereof being next to each other such that said first and second circumferential depressions together form a circumferential recess; ...

 said first and second circumferential depressions having side walls respectively extending to said first and second inner raceway surfaces at positions radially inward of said rolling balls such that said rolling balls overhang said circumferential depression[.]

The circumferential depressions of the first and second inner rings are configured to maximize a storage space for grease. This is done by having their side walls extend up to raceways at position which are underneath the rolling balls of the bearing, i.e., "radially inward of said rolling balls." Thus, the circumferential depression is formed to be wide and also has a diameter smaller than that of the raceways to provide depth for storing grease. It is this formation that results in a configuration wherein "said rolling balls overhang said circumferential depression." This feature is not found in the applied Hughes reference.

In contrast to the present invention, the inner races of the bearing of Hughes do not have a circumferential depression that begin a positions radially inward of the balls. Instead, a radially inward projection of the balls does not intercept the slight bevels in the Hughes bearing.

Docket No. F-8507

Ser. No. 10/518,280

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 3 is rejected as obvious over the Hughes reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 4 is rejected as obvious over the Hughes reference in view of the Takata reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 7 is rejected as obvious over the Hughes reference in view of the Ishigura reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary references do not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection that is absent from the primary Hughes reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 3, 4 and 7 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Docket No. F-8507

Ser. No. 10/518,280

NEW CLAIMS

New claim 9 is added and is directed to the concaved side walls of the circumferential depressions. Claims 10 and 11 are directed to the side walls joining the raceways at positions that are closer to a radial projection of the ball centers than a projection of the outer peripheries of the balls. These features are not shown in the art and further serve to increase storage volume in the recess for storing grease.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicants respectfully request three month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of \$1050 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

04/23/2008 VBUI11 00000009 10518280
01 FC:1253 1050.00 0P

Docket No. F-8507

Ser. No. 10/518,280

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By *C.B.Hamburg* by *HFRuschmann*
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
35341
Attorney for Applicants
and,

By *HFRuschmann*
Herbert F. Ruschmann
Reg. No. 35,341
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038.